arXiv:1510.00809v1 [math.CO] 3 Oct 2015

Total weight choosability of d-degenerate graphs

Tsai-Lien Wong [*] Xuding Zhu [†]

October 6, 2015

Abstract

A graph G is (k,k')-choosable if the following holds: For any list assignment L which assigns to each vertex v a set $L(v)$ of k real numbers, and assigns to each edge e a set $L(e)$ of k' real numbers, there is a total weighting $\phi : V(G) \cup E(G) \to R$ such that $\phi(z) \in L(z)$ for $z \in V \cup E$, and $\sum_{e \in E(u)} \phi(e) + \phi(u) \neq \sum_{e \in E(v)} \phi(e) + \phi(v)$ for every edge uv. This paper proves the following results: (1) If G is a connected d-degenerate graph, and $k > d$ is a prime number, and G is either non-bipartite or has two non-adjacent vertices u, v with $d(u) + d(v) < k$, then G is $(1,k)$-choosable. As a consequence, every planar graph with no isolated edges is $(1,7)$-choosable, and every connected 2-degenerate non-bipartite graph other than K_2 is $(1,3)$-choosable. (2) If $d+1$ is a prime number, $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ is an ordering of the vertices of G such that each vertex v_i has back degree $d^-(v_i) \leq d$, then there is a graph G' obtained from G by adding at most $d - d^-(v_i)$ leaf neighbours to v_i (for each i) and G' is $(1,2)$-choosable. (3) If G is d-degenerate and $d+1$ a prime, then G is $(d,2)$-choosable. In particular, 2-degenerate graphs are $(2,2)$-choosable. (4) Every graph is $(\lceil \frac{\mathrm{mad}(G)}{2} \rceil + 1, 2)$ -choosable. In particular, planar graphs are $(4,2)$-choosable, planar bipartite graphs are $(3,2)$-choosable.

Key words: Total weighting; (k,k')-choosable graphs; permanent; d-degenerate graphs.

[*]Department of Applied Mathematics, National Sun Yat-sen University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan 80424. Grant numbers: MOST 104-2115-M-110 -001 -MY2. Email: tlwong@math.nsysu.edu.tw

[†]Department of Mathematics, Zhejiang Normal University, China. Grant number: NSFC 11571319. Email: xudingzhu@gmail.com.

1 Introduction

A *total weighting* of a graph G is a mapping $\phi : V(G) \cup E(G) \to R$. A total weighting ϕ is *proper* if for any edge uv of G,

$$\sum_{e \in E(u)} \phi(e) + \phi(u) \neq \sum_{e \in E(v)} \phi(e) + \phi(v),$$

where $E(v)$ is the set of edges incident to v. Total weighting of graphs has attracted considerable recent attention [9, 1, 2, 16, 6, 11, 12, 13, 19, 21].

The well-known 1-2-3 conjecture, proposed by Karoński, Łuczak and Thomason [9], asserts that every graph with no isolated edge has a proper total weighting ϕ with $\phi(v) = 0$ for every vertex and $\phi(e) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ for every edge e. The conjecture has been studied by many authors [1, 2, 16] and the current best result is that the conjecture would be true if instead of $\{1, 2, 3\}$, every edge e can have weight $\phi(e) \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$ [11]. The 1-2 conjecture, proposed by Przybyło and Woźniak in [12], asserts that every graph G has a proper total weighting ϕ with $\phi(z) \in \{1, 2\}$ for all $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$. The best result on this conjecture is that every graph G has a proper total weighting ϕ with $\phi(v) \in \{1, 2\}$ for $v \in V(G)$ and $\phi(e) \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ for $e \in E(G)$ [10].

Total weighting of graphs is naturally extended to the list version, independently by Przybyło and Woźniak [13] and by Wong and Zhu [19]. Suppose $\psi : V(G) \cup E(G) \to \{1, 2, \ldots, \}$ is a mapping which assigns to each vertex and each edge of G a positive integer. A ψ-list assignment of G is a mapping L which assigns to $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$ a set $L(z)$ of $\psi(z)$ real numbers. Given a total list assignment L, a proper L-total weighting is a proper total weighting ϕ with $\phi(z) \in L(z)$ for all $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$. We say G is *total weight ψ-choosable* if for any ψ-list assignment L, there is a proper L-total weighting of G. We say G is (k, k')-choosable if G is ψ-total weight choosable, where $\psi(v) = k$ for $v \in V(G)$ and $\psi(e) = k'$ for $e \in E(G)$.

As strengthenings of the 1-2-3 conjecture and the 1-2 conjecture, it was conjectured in [19] that every graph with no isolated edges is $(1, 3)$-choosable and every graph is $(2, 2)$-choosable. Some special graphs are shown to be $(1, 3)$-choosable, such as complete graphs, complete bipartite graphs, trees [6], Cartesian product of an even number of even cycles, of a path and an even cycle, of two paths [17]. Some special graphs are shown to be $(2, 2)$-choosable, such as complete graphs, generalized theta graphs, trees [19], subcubic graphs, Halin graphs [20], complete bipartite graphs [18].

It was shown in [21] that every graph is $(2, 3)$-choosable. However, it is unknown whether there is a constant k such that every graph with no isolated edge is $(1, k)$-choosable, and whether there is a constant k such that every graph is $(k, 2)$-choosable.

For graphs G of maximum degree k with no isolated edges, it was proved by Seamone [14] that G is $(1, 2k + 1)$-choosable, by Wang and Yan [15] that G is $(1, \lceil \frac{4k+8}{3} \rceil)$-choosable, and recently, it is proved in [8] that G is $(1, k + 1)$-choosable. In this paper, we first

consider connected d-degenerate graphs G. We prove that if $k > d \geq 2$ and either G is non-bipartite or G is bipartite and there are two non-adjacent vertices u, v with $d(u)+d(v) < k$, then G is $(1,k)$-choosable. As a consequence, every planar graph with no isolated edges is $(1,7)$-choosable, and every connected 2-degenerate non-bipartite graph other than K_2 is $(1,3)$-choosable. Next we prove that if $d+1$ is a prime number and G is a d-degenerate graph, $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ is an ordering of the vertices of G such that each vertex v_i has back degree $d^-(v_i) \leq d$, then there is a graph G' obtained from G by adding at most $d - d^-(v_i)$ leaf neighbours to v_i (for each i) and G' is $(1,2)$-choosable. In particular, if $d+1$ is a prime number, and G is a d-tree, then for any d-clique K of G, there is a graph G' obtained from G by adding at most j leaf neighbours to the jth vertex of K so that the resulting graph is $(1,2)$-choosable.

For $(k,2)$-choosability, we prove that if G is d-degenerate and $d+1$ a prime, then G is $(d,2)$-choosable. In particular, 2-degenerate graphs are $(2,2)$-choosable. In the last section, we prove that every graph is $(\lceil mad(G)/2 \rceil + 1, 2)$-choosable. In particular, planar graphs are $(4,2)$-choosable, planar bipartite graphs are $(3,2)$-choosable.

2 $(1,k)$-choosability

This section proves the following result.

Theorem 1 *Assume G is a connected d-degenerate graph, $k > d \geq 2$ is a prime number and one of the following holds:*

- *G is non-bipartite.*
- *G is bipartite,and there are two non-adjacent vertices u, v with $d(u) + d(v) < k$.*

Then G is $(1,k)$-choosable.

For each $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$, let x_z be a variable associated to z. Fix an arbitrary orientation D of G. Consider the polynomial

$$P_G(\{x_z : z \in V(G) \cup E(G)\}) = \prod_{uv \in E(D)} \left(\left(\sum_{e \in E(u)} x_e + x_u \right) - \left(\sum_{e \in E(v)} x_e + x_v \right) \right).$$

Assign a real number $\phi(z)$ to the variable x_z, and view $\phi(z)$ as the weight of z. Let $P_G(\phi)$ be the evaluation of the polynomial at $x_z = \phi(z)$. Then ϕ is a proper total weighting of G if and only if $P_G(\phi) \neq 0$. The question is under what condition one can find an assignment ϕ for which $P_G(\phi) \neq 0$.

An *index function* of G is a mapping η which assigns to each vertex or edge z of G a non-negative integer $\eta(z)$. An index function η of G is *valid* if $\sum_{z \in V \cup E} \eta(z) = |E|$. Note that

$|E|$ is the degree of the polynomial $P_G(\{x_z : z \in V(G) \cup E(G)\})$. For a valid index function η, let c_η be the coefficient of the monomial $\prod_{z \in V \cup E} x_z^{\eta(z)}$ in the expansion of P_G. It follows from the Combinatorial Nullstellensatz [3, 5] that if $c_\eta \neq 0$, and L is a list assignment which assigns to each $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$ a set $L(z)$ of $\eta(z) + 1$ real numbers, then there exists a mapping ϕ with $\phi(z) \in L(z)$ such that

$$P_G(\phi) \neq 0.$$

An index function η of G is called *non-singular* if there is a valid index function $\eta' \leq \eta$ (i.e., $\eta'(z) \leq \eta(z)$ for all $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$) such that $c_{\eta'} \neq 0$.

The main result of this section, Theorem 1, follows from Theorem 2.

Theorem 2 *Assume G is a connected d-degenerate graph, $k > d \geq 2$ is a prime number and one of the following holds:*

- *G is non-bipartite.*
- *G is bipartite, and there are two non-adjacent vertices u, v with $d(u) + d(v) < k$.*

Then G has a non-singular index function η with $\eta(v) = 0$ for $v \in V(G)$ and $\eta(e) \leq k - 1$ for $e \in E(G)$.

We write the polynomial $P_G(\{x_z : z \in V(G) \cup E(G)\})$ as

$$P_G(\{x_z : z \in V(G) \cup E(G)\}) = \prod_{e \in E(D)} \sum_{z \in V(G) \cup E(G)} A_G[e, z] x_z.$$

It is straightforward to verify that for $e \in E(G)$ and $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$, if $e = (u, v)$ (oriented from u to v), then

$$A_G[e, z] = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } z = v, \text{ or } z \neq e \text{ is an edge incident to } v, \\ -1 & \text{if } z = u, \text{ or } z \neq e \text{ is an edge incident to } u, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Now A_G is a matrix, whose rows are indexed by edges of G and the columns are indexed by edges and vertices of G. Given a vertex or an edge z of G, let $A_G(z)$ be the column of A_G indexed by z. As observed in [19], for an edge $e = uv$ of G, we have

$$A_G(e) = A_G(u) + A_G(v). \tag{1}$$

For an index function η of G, let $A_G(\eta)$ be the matrix, each of its column is a column of A_G, and each column $A_G(z)$ of A_G occurs $\eta(z)$ times as a column of $A_G(\eta)$. For $e \in E(G)$ and $z \in E(G) \cup V(G)$ with $\eta(z) \geq 1$, $A_G[e, z]$ denote the entry of $A_G(\eta)$ at row e and column

z, and $A_G[\overline{e}, \overline{z}]$ denotes the matrix obtained from $A_G(\eta)$ by deleting the row indexed by e and a column indexed by z.

It is known [4] and easy to verify that for a valid index function η of G, $c_\eta \neq 0$ if and only if $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta)) \neq 0$ (here $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta))$ denotes the permanent of $A_G(\eta)$). Thus a valid index function η of G is non-singular if and only if $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta)) \neq 0$.

It is well-known (and follows easily from the definition) that the permanent of a matrix is multi-linear on its column vectors (as well as its row vectors): If a column C of A is a linear combination of two columns vectors $C = \alpha C' + \beta C''$, and A' (respectively, A'') is obtained from A by replacing the column C with C' (respectively, with C''), then

$$\mathrm{per}(A) = \alpha \mathrm{per}(A') + \beta \mathrm{per}(A''). \tag{2}$$

Assume A is a square matrix whose columns are linear combinations of columns of A_G. Define an index function $\eta_A : V(G) \cup E(G) \to \{0, 1, \ldots, \}$ as follows:

For $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$, $\eta_A(z)$ is the number of columns of A in which $A_G(z)$ appears in the linear combinations with nonzero coefficient.

Note that the columns of A_G are not linearly independent. There are different ways of expressing the columns of a same matrix A as linear combination of columns of A_G. So η_A is not uniquely determined by the matrix A itself, instead it depends on how its columns are expressed as linear combinations of columns of A_G. For simplicity, we use the notation η_A, and each time the function η_A is used, it refers to an explicit expression of the columns of A as linear combinations of columns of A_G. In particular, for an index function η of G, we may write a column of $A_G(\eta)$ as a linear combination of other columns of A_G, and $\eta_{A_G(\eta)}$ may become another index function of G.

To prove that a graph is $(1, k)$-choosable, it suffices to find a square matrix A with $\mathrm{per}(A) \neq 0$ whose columns are linear combinations of columns of A_G such that for each $v \in V(G)$, $\eta_A(v) = 0$, and for each edge e of G, $\eta_A(e) \leq k - 1$.

Lemma 1 *Assume G is a connected d-degenerate graph, $k > d \geq 2$ is a prime number and one of the following holds:*

- *G is non-bipartite.*
- *G is bipartite and there are two non-adjacent vertices u, v with $d(u) + d(v) < k$.*

Then there is a matrix A whose columns are integral linear combinations (i.e., linear combination with integer coefficients) of edge columns of G such that $\mathrm{per}(A) \neq 0 \pmod{k}$.

Before proving Lemma 1, we first show that Theorem 2 follows from Lemma 1. Assume there is a matrix A whose columns are linear combinations of edge columns of G such that

per$(A) \neq 0 \pmod k$. By repeatedly using (2), we know that there is a matrix A' whose columns are edge columns of G and per$(A') \neq 0 \pmod k$. If each edge column occurs at most $k-1$ times in A', then we are done. If there is an edge column which appears k' times for some $k' \geq k$, then per(A') is a multiple of $k'!$, and hence per$(A') = 0 \pmod k$, contrary to our choice of A'. This proves that Theorem 2 follows from Lemma 1.

Proof of Lemma 1 First we consider the case that G is non-bipartite. Since G is a d-degenerate graph, there is an ordering $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ of the vertices such that for each i, vertex v_i has $d^-(v_i) \leq d$ neighbours v_j with $j < i$. Let A be the square matrix which consists of $d^-(v_i)$ copies of $2A_G(v_i)$. It can be proved easily by induction on n that $|\text{per}(A)| = 2^m \prod_{i=1}^n d^-(v_i)!$. As G is non-bipartite, we know that $d \geq 2$ and hence $k > 2$. Also by our hypothesis, $d^-(v_i) \leq d < k$ for each i. Hence per$(A) \neq 0 \pmod k$.

It suffices to show that each column of A is an integral linear combination of edge columns of G. In other words, for each vertex v of G, $2A_G(v)$ can be written as an integral linear combination of edge columns of G.

By assumption G is connected and has an odd cycle $(u_0, e_0, u_1, e_1, \ldots, u_{2q}, e_{2q}, u_0)$. If v is on the cycle, say $v = u_0$, then $2A_G(u_0) = A_G(e_0) - A_G(e_1) + A_G(e_2) - \ldots + A_G(e_{2q})$. If v is not on the odd cycle, then let $(w_0, e'_0, w_1, e'_1, \ldots, e'_{t-1}, w_t)$ be a path connecting v to u_0, say $w_0 = v$ and $w_t = u_0$. Then $2A_G(w_0) = 2A_G(e'_0) - 2A_G(e'_1) + 2A_G(e'_2) - \ldots \pm 2A_G(e'_{t-1}) \mp 2A_G(w_t)$, and then write $2A_G(w_t)$ as an integral linear combination of edge columns of G, we are done. This prove the non-bipartite case of Lemma 1.

Assume G is bipartite, and u, v are the two specified vertices, and $d' = d(u) + d(v)$. Similarly as above, there is an ordering $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_{n-2}$ of the vertices of $G - \{u, v\}$ such that for each i, vertex v_i has $d^-(v_i) \leq d$ neighbours v_j with $j < i$. Let $u = v_{n-1}, v = v_n$. Let A be the matrix which consists of $d^-(v_i)$ copies of $A_G(v_i) \pm A_G(v)$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n-2$ and d' copies of $A_G(u) \pm A_G(v)$, where the $\pm$ is determined by the distance between the two involved vertices: if the distance is odd, then choose $+$, and otherwise choose $-$. It is easy to verify that $|\text{per}(A)| = (\prod_{i=1}^{n-2} d^-(v_i)!)d'!$. Hence per$(A) \neq 0 \pmod k$.

It suffices to show that each column of A can be written as an integral linear combination of edge columns of G. This is so, because if x, y are two vertices connected by a path of odd length $(u_0, e_0, u_1, e_1, \ldots, u_{2q}, e_{2q}, u_{2q+1})$, say $x = u_0, y = u_{2q+1}$, then $A_G(x) + A_G(y) = A_G(e_0) - A_G(e_1) + \ldots + A_G(e_{2q})$. If x, y are two vertices connected by a path of even length $(u_0, e_0, u_1, e_1, \ldots, u_{2q-1}, e_{2q-1}, u_{2q})$, say $x = u_0, y = u_{2q}$, then $A_G(x) - A_G(y) = A_G(e_0) - A_G(e_1) + \ldots - A_G(e_{2q-1})$. This completes the proof of Lemma 1. ∎

Corollary 1 *If G is d-degenerate, non-bipartite graph, then G is $(1, 2d-3)$-choosable.*

Proof. Using the Bertrand Theorem that for $d > 3$, there is a prime p such that $d < p < 2d - 2$. ∎

Corollary 2 *If $G \neq K_2$ is a tree, or a 2-tree, then G is $(1, 3)$-choosable. If G is a 3-tree, then G is $(1, 5)$-choosable. If $d \geq 4$ and G is a d-tree, then G is $(1, 2d-3)$-choosable.*

Proof. All these follow easily from Theorem 1 and Corollary 1 ∎

The result that trees are $(1,3)$-choosable was proved in [6], however, the proof is different from the one presented here.

Corollary 3 *Every planar graph with no isolated edges is* $(1,7)$*-choosable.*

Proof. We may assume G is connected, for otherwise, we consider components of G separately. It is well-known that every planar graph is 5-degenerate. If G is non-bipartite, then we are done by Theorem 1. If G is bipartite, then G is triangle free. By Euler formula G has minimum degree $\delta(G) \leq 3$. If $\delta(G) = 3$, then it follows from Euler formula that G has at least 8 vertices of degree 3, and hence there are non-adjacent vertices u and v with $d(u)+d(v) < 7$. In case $\delta(G) = 1$ or 2, it is also easy to see that there are two non-adjacent vertices u, v with $d(u) + d(v) < 7$. So the conclusion again follows from Theorem 1. ∎

3 Almost $(1,2)$-choosability

In this section, we prove the following result.

Theorem 3 *Assume $d+1$ is a prime number and G is a d-degenerate graph. Let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ be an ordering of the vertices of G such that each vertex v_i has $d^-(v_i) \leq d$ backward neighbours. Then there is a $(1,2)$-choosable graph G' obtained from G by adding at most $d - d^-(v_i)$ leaf neighbours to v_i (i.e., neighbours of degree 1).*

Prior to this paper, all the known $(1,2)$-choosable graphs are bipartite graphs. As a consequence of this lemma, every graph G is a subgraph of a $(1,2)$-choosable graph G'.

Before proving Theorem 3, we shall first prove that if G is d-degenerate and each vertex of G has backdegree "almost" d, then G is "almost" $(1,2)$-choosable.

Lemma 2 *Assume G is a graph and η is a non-singular index function of G, and E' is a subset of edges of G. If $\eta(e) = 0$ for every $e \in E'$, then η is a non-singular index function of $G - E'$.*

Proof. Let $G' = G - E'$. As $\eta(e) = 0$ for every $e \in E'$, $A_{G'}(\eta)$ is the matrix obtained from $A_G(\eta)$ by deleting the rows indexed by edges $e \in E'$. Since $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta)) \neq 0$, one can delete some columns from $A_{G'}(\eta)$ to obtain a square matrix with nonzero permanent. I.e., there is a valid index function η' of G' such that $\eta' \leq \eta$, and $\mathrm{per}(A_{G'}(\eta')) \neq 0$. Thus η is a non-singular index function of G'. ∎

Theorem 4 *Assume $d+1$ is a prime number, G is a d-degenerate graph, and $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ is an ordering of the vertices such that for each i, vertex v_i has $d^-(v_i) \leq d$ backward neighbours. Let G' be obtained from G by adding $d - d^-(v_i)$ leaf neighbours to v_i for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. Let η be the index function of G' defined as $\eta(v_i) = d - d^-(v_i)$ and $\eta(e) = 1$ for each edge e of G, and $\eta(z) = 0$ for each added vertex and edge. Then* $\mathrm{per}(A_{G'}(\eta)) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$.

Proof. Let $M_0 = A_{G'}(\eta)$. For $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, let M_i be obtained from M_{i-1} as follows: For each edge $e = v_i v_j \in E(G)$ with $j < i$, replace the edge column $A_{G'}(e)$ with $A_{G'}(v_i)$.

Claim 1 *For any $j \leq i$, M_i contains exactly d copies of the column $A_{G'}(v_j)$ and* $\mathrm{per}(M_i) = \mathrm{per}(M_{i-1}) \pmod{d+1}$.

First we prove that M_i contains exactly d copies of the column $A_{G'}(v_j)$ for any $j \leq i$. This is certainly true for $i = 1$, because $M_1 = M_0$ and $\eta(v_1) = d$. Assume this is true for M_{i-1}. By the rule above, $d^-(v_i)$ copies of $A_{G'}(v_i)$ are used to replace $d^-(v_i)$ edge columns. Since M_{i-1} has $\eta(v_i) = d - d^-(v_i)$ copies of $A_{G'}(v_i)$, we conclude that M_i contains exactly d copies of $A_{G'}(v_i)$ as its column vectors.

Now we prove $\mathrm{per}(M_i) = \mathrm{per}(M_{i-1}) \pmod{d+1}$. For each edge $e = v_i v_j$ with $j < i$, we write the column $A_{G'}(e)$ in M_{i-1} as $A_{G'}(v_i) + A_{G'}(v_j)$. Apply (2) to expand $\mathrm{per}(M_{i-1})$ as the sum of a family of permanents. Then $\mathrm{per}(M_i)$ is one of the permanents. For each of the other permanents M', there is an index $j < i$ such that M' contains at least one more column of $A_{G'}(v_j)$ than M_{i-1}, and hence contains at least $d+1$ copies of the column $A_{G'}(v_j)$. Therefore $\mathrm{per}(M') = 0 \pmod{d+1}$. Therefore $\mathrm{per}(M_i) = \mathrm{per}(M_{i-1}) \pmod{d+1}$. This completes the proof of the claim.

Let η' be the index function defined as $\eta'(v) = d$ for $v \in V(G)$, $\eta'(v) = 0$ for $v \in V(G') \setminus V(G)$ and $\eta'(e) = 0$ for each edge e of G'. By Claim 1, $M_n = A_{G'}(\eta')$. As each vertex $v \in V(G)$ has back degree exactly d, we conclude that $|\mathrm{per}(M_n)| = (d!)^n \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$. Therefore $\mathrm{per}(A_{G'}(\eta)) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$. So η is a non-singular index function of G'. By Lemma 2, η is a non-singular index function of G. ∎

If $d+1$ is prime, G is d-degenerate and almost every vertex has back degree exactly d, then G is "almost" $(1,2)$-choosable. For example, we have the following corollary.

Corollary 4 *If $d+1$ is a prime number and G is a d-tree, then G is almost $(1,2)$-choosable, except that the first d vertices require lists of sizes $d+1, d, \ldots, 2$, respectively. In particular, if G is a tree, and v is an arbitrary vertex of G, then G is $(1,2)$-choosable, except that v needs a list of size 2. If G is 2-degenerate, and every vertex except the first 2 vertices have back-degree exactly 2, then G is almost $(1,2)$-choosable, except that for the first two vertices v_1, v_2 need a list of size 3.*

Now we are ready to prove Theorem 3. For a graph G, let $B_G = A_G(\eta)$, where $\eta(e) = 1$ for each edge e, and $\eta(v) = 0$ for each vertex v.

Lemma 3 *Assume η is an index function of a graph G and X is a set of leaves of G for which the following hold:*

1. *For each edge e, $\eta(e) = 0$ if e is incident to a vertex in X and $\eta(e) = 1$ otherwise.*
2. *For each vertex v, $\eta(v) = |N_G(v) \cap X|$.*

If $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta)) \neq 0$, then there is a subset Y of X such that $G - Y$ is $(1,2)$-choosable.

Proof. Assume the lemma is not true and G is a minimum counterexample.

For each vertex v of G, let $N_G(v) \cap X = \{v'_j : 1 \leq j \leq \eta(v)\}$ and let $e_{v,j} = vv'_j$. Take the matrix B_G, and for each edge $e_{v,j}$, write $A_G(e_{v,j})$ as the sum $A_G(v) + A_G(v'_j)$. By repeatedly using (2), $\mathrm{per}(B_G)$ can be written as the summation of the permanents of many matrices. To be precise, $\mathrm{per}(B_G) = \sum_{\eta' \in \Gamma} A_G(\eta')$, where Γ consists of all the index functions η' such that

1. $\eta'(e) = \eta(e)$ for each edge e.
2. For $v'_j \in X$, $\eta'(v'_j) = 0$ or 1.
3. For each vertex v, $\eta'(v) = \eta(v) - |\{v'_j : \eta'(v'_j) = 1\}|$.

Observe that $\eta \in \Gamma$.

Claim 2 *If $\eta' \in \Gamma$ and $\eta' \neq \eta$, then $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta')) = 0$.*

Proof. Assume to the contrary that there exists $\eta' \in \Gamma$, $\eta' \neq \eta$, $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta')) \neq 0$.

Let $Z = \{v'_j \in X : \eta'(v'_j) = 1\}$. As $\eta' \neq \eta$, $Z \neq \emptyset$. The column $A_G(v'_j)$ has only one entry equals 1, namely the entry at the row indexed by $e'_{v,j}$, and all the other entries are 0. Therefore, $\mathrm{per}(A_{G-Z}(\eta')) = \mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta'))$, where in $\mathrm{per}(A_{G-Z}(\eta'))$, η' denotes its restriction to $G - Z$. As $\mathrm{per}(A_{G-Z}(\eta')) \neq 0$, $G' = G - Z$ together with η' and $X' = X - Z$ satisfy the condition of Lemma 3. By the minimality of G, there is a subset Y' of X', such that $G' - Y'$ is $(1,2)$-choosable. Let $Y = Y' \cup Z$, we have $G - Y$ is $(1,2)$-choosable, a contradiction. This completes the proof of Claim 2. ∎

Now Claim 2 implies that $\mathrm{per}(B_G) = \mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta)) \neq 0$, and hence G itself is $(1,2)$-choosable, a contradiction. ∎

Theorem 3 follows from Theorem 4 and Lemma 3.

Corollary 5 *If $d+1$ is a prime number, G is d-tree, and K is a d-clique in G, then there is a $(1,2)$-choosable graph which is obtained from G by adding $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_d$ leaf neighbours to the d vertices of K respectively, for some $k_j \leq j$.*

Proof. The vertices of G can be ordered as $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ so that $K = \{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_d\}$ and v_j has $j-1$ backward neighbours for $j \leq d$, and each other vertex has d backward neighbours. The conclusion then follows from Theorem 3. ∎

The $d = 1$ case of Corollary 5 was proved in [7], where it is shown that trees with an even number of edges are $(1,2)$-choosable.

4 $(k,2)$-choosability

By applying Theorem 4, we prove in this section that when $d+1$ is a prime, then d-degenerate graphs are $(d,2)$-choosable. In particular, 2-degenerate graphs are $(2,2)$-choosable.

Theorem 5 *Assume $d+1$ is a prime number, G is a d-degenerate graph. Then G is $(d,2)$-choosable.*

Proof. Assume Theorem 5 is not true, and G is a connected d-degenerate graph which is not $(d,2)$-choosable. Let $v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_n$ be an ordering of the vertices of G such that $1 \leq d^-(v_i) \leq d$ for $2 \leq i \leq n$ (note that $d^-(v_1) = 0$). Let G' by obtained from G by adding $d - d^-(v_i)$ leaf neighbours to v_i for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

Let η be the index function of G' such that $\eta(e) = 1$ for every edge e of G, $\eta(v_i) = d - d^-(v_i)$ for every vertex of G, and $\eta(z) = 0$ for all the added vertices and edges z. Since $1 \leq d^-(v_i) \leq d$ for $i > 1$, hence $\eta(v_i) \leq d-1$ for every vertex of G except that $\eta(v_1) = d$.

Since $|E(G')| = |E(G)| + \sum_{i=1}^{n}(d - d^-(v_i))$, $A_{G'}(\eta)$ is a square matrix. By Theorem 4, we have $\mathrm{per}(A_{G'}(\eta)) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$.

It follows from Lemma 2 that there is a non-singular index function η' of G with $\eta'(z) \leq \eta(z)$ for $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$. In the following, we shall further prove that there is such an index function η' for which $\eta'(v_1)$ is strictly less than $\eta(v_1)$. Hence $\eta'(z) \leq d-1$ for all $z \in V(G)$ and $\eta'(z) \leq 1$ for all $z \in E(G)$ and hence G is $(d,2)$-choosable, which is in contrary to our assumption.

We define a *comb-plus subgraph* of G' as a subgraph indicated in Figure 1, where $(w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_p)$ is a path in G, w_p adjacent to w_s for some $1 \leq s \leq p-2$, and $e'_j = w_j u_j \in E(G') - E(G)$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, p$.

Claim 3 *There is a comb-plus subgraph of G' as in Figure 1 for which the following hold:*



Figure 1: The comb-plus subgraph

- $\eta(w_1) = d$ *and* $\eta(w_j) = d-1$ *for* $2 \le j \le p$ *and* $\eta(e_j) = 1$ *for* $1 \le j \le p$, *where* $e_j = w_j w_{j+1}$ *for* $1 \le j \le p-1$ *and* $e_p = w_p w_s$.
- *For* $0 \le i \le p$, $\mathrm{per}(A_{H_i}(\eta_i)) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$, *where* $H_i = G' - \{e'_1, e'_2, \ldots, e'_i\}$, *and* $\eta_i = \eta$, *except that* $\eta_i(e_j) = 0$ *for* $1 \le j \le i$.

Proof. We choose the vertices $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_p$, and hence the edges $e'_1, e_1, e'_2, e_2, \ldots, e'_p, e_p$, recursively. Initially let $w_1 = v_1$. Let $e'_1 = w_1 u_1$ be an added edge incident to w_1 (recall that v_1 is incident to d added edges). Note that $H_0 = G'$ and $\eta_0 = \eta$.

Calculating $\mathrm{per}(A_{H_0}(\eta_0))$ by expanding along the row indexed by e'_1, we conclude that there is a column of $A_{H_0}(\eta_0)$ indexed by $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$ such that

$$A_{H_0}(\eta_0)[e'_1, z] \neq 0 \pmod{d+1} \text{ and } \mathrm{per}(A_{H_0}(\eta_0)[\overline{e'_1}, \overline{z}]) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}.$$

As $A_{H_0}(\eta_0)[e'_1, z] \neq 0$, we know that either $z = w_1$ or z is an edge of G incident to w_1.

Note that $H_1 = H_0 - e'_1$, hence

$$A_{H_0}(\eta_0)[\overline{e'_1}, \overline{z}] = A_{H_1}(\eta_1)$$

where η_1 agrees with η_0, except that $\eta_1(z) = \eta_0(z) - 1$.

If $z = w_1$, then $\eta_1(w_1) = d-1$. It follows from Lemma 2 that there is a non-singular index function η' for which $\eta'(z) \le d-1$ for all $z \in V(G)$ and $\eta'(z) \le 1$ for all $z \in E(G)$, and hence G is $(d, 2)$-choosable, contrary to our assumption.

Assume z is an edge of G incident to w_1. Let w_2 be the other end vertex of z, and let $e_1 = z = w_1 w_2$. If $\eta(w_2) \le d-2$, then write the column $A_{H_1}(w_1)$ of $A_{H_1}(\eta_1)$ as $A_{H_1}(e_1) - A_{H_1}(w_2)$. By this expression of the matrix $A_{H_1}(\eta_1)$, we have $\eta_{A_{H_1}(\eta_1)}(z) \le d-1$

for all $z \in V(G)$ and $\eta_{A_{H_1}(\eta_1)}(z) \leq 1$ for all $z \in E(G)$ and $\eta_{A_{H_1}(\eta_1)}(z) = 0$ for all $z \notin V(G) \cup E(G)$. As $\mathrm{per}(A_{H_1}(\eta_1)) \neq 0$, by Lemma 2, G is $(d, 2)$-choosable, contrary to our assumption.

Thus we may assume that $\eta(w_2) = d - 1$.

Assume $i \geq 1$, and we have chosen distinct vertices $w_1, w_2, \ldots, w_i$, edges $e'_1, e'_2, \ldots, e'_i$ and $e_1 = w_1w_2, e_2 = w_2w_3, \ldots, e_i = w_iw_{i+1}$, for which the following hold:

- $\eta(w_1) = d$ and $\eta(w_j) = d - 1$ for $2 \leq j \leq i + 1$ and $\eta(e_j) = 1$ for $1 \leq j \leq i$.
- $\eta_j = \eta_{j-1}$ except that $\eta_j(e_j) = \eta_{j-1}(e_j) - 1 = 0$ for $1 \leq j \leq i$.
- For $0 \leq j \leq i$, $\mathrm{per}(A_{H_j}(\eta_j)) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$.

If $w_{i+1} = w_s$ for some $1 \leq s \leq i - 2$, then let $p = i$, and the claim is proved. Assume $w_{i+1} \neq w_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq i - 2$. Since $\eta(w_{i+1}) = d - 1$, $d - d^-(w_{i+1}) = d - 1$ and there is an edge $e'_{i+1} = w_{i+1}u_{i+1} \in E(G') - E(G)$. As $w_{i+1} \neq w_j$ for any $1 \leq j \leq i - 2$, we have $e'_{i+1} \in E(H_i)$.

Calculating $\mathrm{per}(A_{H_i}(\eta_i))$ by expanding along the row indexed by e'_{i+1}, we conclude that there is a column of $A_{H_i}(\eta_i)$ indexed by $z \in V(G) \cup E(G)$ such that

$$A_{H_i}(\eta_i)[e'_{i+1}, z] \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}, \ \mathrm{per}(A_{H_i}(\eta_i)[\overline{e'_{i+1}}, \overline{z}]) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}.$$

Similarly, $A_{H_i}(\eta_i)[e'_{i+1}, z] \neq 0$ implies that either $z = w_{i+1}$ or z is an edge of G incident to w_{i+1}.

As $H_{i+1} = H_i - e'_{i+1}$, we have

$$A_{H_i}(\eta_i)[\overline{e'_{i+1}}, \overline{z}] = A_{H_{i+1}}(\eta_{i+1})$$

where η_{i+1} is an index function which agrees with η_i, except that $\eta_{i+1}(z) = \eta_i(z) - 1$.

If $z = w_{i+1}$, then $\eta_{i+1}(w_{i+1}) = d - 2$. In $A_{H_{i+1}}$,

$$A_{H_{i+1}}(w_1) = A_{H_{i+1}}(e_1) - A_{H_{i+1}}(e_2) + A_{H_{i+1}}(e_3) - \ldots + (-1)^{i-1}A_{H_{i+1}}(e_i) + (-1)^i A_{H_{i+1}}(w_{i+1}).$$

By this expression of the columns of $A_{H_{i+1}}(\eta_{i+1})$, the column $A_{H_{i+1}}(z)$ occurs at most $d-1$ times for each $z \in V(G)$ and the column $A_{H_{i+1}}(z)$ occurs at most once for each $z \in E(G)$. For each $z \notin V(G) \cup E(G)$, the column $A_{H_{i+1}}(z)$ does not occur. By Lemma 2, G is $(d, 2)$-choosable, contrary to our assumption.

Assume z is an edge of G incident to w_{i+1}. Let w_{i+2} be the other end vertex of z and let $e_{i+1} = z = w_{i+1}w_{i+2}$. If $\eta_{i+1}(w_{i+2}) \leq d - 2$, then in $A_{H_{i+1}}(\eta_{i+1})$,

$$A_{H_{i+1}}(w_1) = A_{H_{i+1}}(e_1) - A_{H_{i+1}}(e_2) + A_{H_{i+1}}(e_3) - \ldots + (-1)^i A_{H_{i+1}}(e_{i+1}) + (-1)^{i+1} A_{H_{i+1}}(w_{i+2}),$$

which again leads to a contradiction. Thus $\eta_{i+1}(w_{i+2}) = d - 1$.

This process of finding new vertices w_j will eventually stop (as G is finite), and at the end we obtain the required comb-plus subgraph. This completes the proof of Claim 3. ∎

Assume first that $s = 1$, and hence $C = (w_1, w_2, \cdots, w_p)$ is a cycle. By definition, $\eta_p(w_1) = d$, $\eta_p(w_i) = d-1$ for $2 \le i \le p$ and $\eta_p(e_i) = 0$ for $1 \le i \le p$.

Claim 4 *Let $\eta'_p = \eta_p$ except that $\eta'_p(w_2) = \eta_p(w_2) - 1 = d-2$ and $\eta'_p(e_1) = \eta_p(e_1) + 1 = 1$.*

$$\mathrm{per}(A_{H_p}(\eta'_p)) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}.$$

Proof. To prove this claim, we write the column $A_{H_p}(e_1)$ as $A_{H_p}(w_1) + A_{H_p}(w_2)$. By linearity of permanent with respect to columns,

$$\mathrm{per}(A_{H_p}(\eta'_p)) = \mathrm{per}(A') + \mathrm{per}(A''),$$

where A' is the matrix obtained from $A_{H_p}(\eta'_p)$ by replacing the column $A_{H_p}(e_1)$ with $A_{H_p}(w_1)$, and A'' is the matrix obtained from $A_{H_p}(\eta_p)$ by replacing the column $A_{H_p}(e_1)$ with $A_{H_p}(w_2)$. Thus $A'' = A_{H_p}(\eta_p)$ and A' contains $d+1$ copies of the column $A_{H_p}(w_1)$. Hence $\mathrm{per}(A') = 0 \pmod{d+1}$. Therefore, $\mathrm{per}(A_{H_p}(\eta'_p)) = \mathrm{per}(A'') \pmod{d+1} = \mathrm{per}(A_{H_p}(\eta_p)) \pmod{d+1} \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$. This completes the proof of Claim 4. ∎

Now in $A_{H_p}(\eta'_p)$, we re-write the columns as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{H_p}(w_3) &= A_{H_p}(e_2) - A_{H_p}(w_2),\\
A_{H_p}(w_4) &= A_{H_p}(e_3) - A_{H_p}(w_3),\\
&\cdots\\
A_{H_p}(w_p) &= A_{H_p}(e_{p-1}) - A_{H_p}(w_{p-1}),\\
A_{H_p}(w_1) &= A_{H_p}(e_p) - A_{H_p}(w_p).
\end{aligned}$$

By using these expressions, in the matrix $A_{H_p}(\eta'_p)$, the column $A_{G'}(z)$ occurs at most $d-1$ times for each $z \in V(G)$ and the column $A_{G'}(z)$ occurs at most once for each $z \in E(G)$. For each $z \notin V(G) \cup E(G)$, the column occurs 0 times. By Lemma 2, G is $(d,2)$-choosable

Assume next that $s \ge 2$. Then the path $P' = (w_1, w_2, \cdots, w_s)$ connect w_1 to a cycle $C = (w_s, w_{s+1}, \ldots, w_p)$. In $A_{H_p}(\eta_p)$, write one copy of $A_{H_p}(w_1)$ as

$$A_{H_p}(e_1) - A_{H_p}(e_2) + \ldots + (-1)^s A_{H_p}(e_{s-1}) + (-1)^{s+1} A_{H_p}(w_s).$$

By using this expression and by linearity of permanent with respect to columns, we obtain an index function η' of H_p in which $\eta'(z) \le d-1$ for all $z \in V(G)$ except that possibly $\eta'(w_s) = d$, and $\eta'(z) \le 1$ for all $z \in E(G)$, such that $\mathrm{per}(A_{H_p}(\eta')) \neq 0 \pmod{d+1}$. Moreover, for this index function η', we have $\eta'(w_i) = d-1$ for $s+1 \le i \le p$, $\eta'(e_i) = 0$ for $s \le i \le p$. This is the same as the $s = 1$ case, and the proof is complete. ∎

Corollary 6 *Every 2-degenerate graph is $(2,2)$-choosable.*

5 Graphs with bounded maximum average degree

The *average degree* $\overline{d}(G)$ of G is $\overline{d}(G) = \frac{2|E(G)|}{|V(G)|}$. The *maximum average degree* of G, denoted by $\mathrm{mad}(G)$, is defined as $\mathrm{mad}(G) = \max\{\overline{d}(H) : H \subseteq G\}$. This section proves that if $\mathrm{mad}(G) \leq 2k$ for some integer k, then G is $(k+1,2)$-choosable.

Lemma 4 *Assume D is an orientation of a graph G, and η is the index function defined as $\eta(v) = d_D^+(v)$ for every vertex v and $\eta(e) = 1$ for every edge e. Then η is a non-singular index function of G.*

Proof. First we prove that the lemma is true if D is an acyclic orientation. In this case, we prove that the index function η defined as $\eta(v) = d_D^+(v)$ for each vertex v and $\eta(e) = 0$ for each edge e is a valid index function with $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta)) \neq 0$.

Assume this is not true and G is a minimum counterexample. As D is acyclic, there is a source vertex v. By the minimality of G, the restriction η' of η to $G - v$ is a non-singular index function of $G - v$. We extend the matrix $A_{G-v}(\eta')$ to $A_G(\eta)$ by adding $d_G(v)$ rows indexed by edges incident to v, and adding $d_G(v) = d_D^+(v)$ copies of the column $A_G(v)$. Then $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta)) = d_G(v)!\mathrm{per}(A_{G-v}(\eta')) \neq 0$.

Next we consider the case that D is an arbitrary orientation. Let D' be an acyclic orientation of G. Let η' be the index function defined as $\eta'(v) = d_{D'}^+(v)$ for each vertex v and $\eta'(e) = 0$ for each edge e. By the previous paragraph, $\mathrm{per}(A_G(\eta')) \neq 0$. For each directed edge $e = (u, v)$ of D' that is oriented differently in D, we replace a copy of the column $A_G(u)$ by the linear combination $A_G(e) - A_G(v)$. Note that the matrix is not changed, because $A_G(u) = A_G(e) - A_G(v)$. However, in such linear combinations of the columns of $A_G(\eta')$, for each edge e, $A_G(e)$ occurs at most once, and for each vertex v, $A_G(v)$ occurs at most $d_D^+(v)$ times. Therefore the index function defined as $\eta(v) = d_D^+(v)$ for every vertex v and $\eta(e) = 1$ for every edge e is a non-singular index function of G. ∎

Corollary 7 *If $\mathrm{mad}(G) \leq 2k$, then G is $(k+1,2)$-choosable. In particular, planar graphs are $(4,2)$-choosable and planar bipartite graphs are $(3,2)$-choosable.*

Proof. It is well-known that if G has maximum average degree at most $2k$, then G has an orientation with maximum out-degree at most k. Therefore the index function η defined as $\eta(v) = k$ for every vertex v and $\eta(e) = 1$ for every edge e is a non-singular index function of G. It follows from the argument in the introduction that G is $(k+1,2)$-choosable. ∎

References

[1] L. Addario-Berry, R.E.L.Aldred, K. Dalal, B.A. Reed, *Vertex colouring edge partitions*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 94 (2005), 237-244.

[2] L. Addario-Berry, K. Dalal, C. McDiarmid, B.A. Reed and A. Thomason, *Vertex-colouring edge-weightings*, Combinatorica 27 (2007), 1-12.

[3] N. Alon, *Combinatorial Nullstellensatz*, Combin. Prob. Comput. 8 (1999), 7-29.

[4] N. Alon and M. Tarsi, *A nowhere zero point in linear mappings*, Combinatorica 9 (1989), 393-395.

[5] N. Alon and M. Tarsi, *Colorings and orientations of graphs*, Combinatorica 12 (1992), 125-134.

[6] T. Bartnicki, J. Grytczuk and S. Niwczyk, *Weight choosability of graphs*, J. Graph Theory 60 (2009), 242-256.

[7] G.J. Chang, A. Duh, T. Wong and X. Zhu, *Total weight choosability of trees*, manuscript.

[8] L. Ding, A. Duh, G. Wang, T. Wong, J. Wu, X. Yu, X. Zhu, *Graphs are* $(1, \Delta + 1)$*-choosable*, manuscript, 2015.

[9] M. Karoński, T. Łuczak, A. Thomason, *Edge weights and vertex colours*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 91 (2004), 151-157.

[10] M. Kalkowski, *On 1,2-conjecture*, manuscript, 2008.

[11] M. Kalkowski, M. Karoński and F. Pfender, *Vertex-coloring edge-weightings: towards the 1-2-3- Conjecture*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. B 100 (2010), 347-349.

[12] J. Przybyło and M. Woźniak, *On a 1-2 conjecture*, Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science 12 (2010), 101-108.

[13] J. Przybyło and M. Woźniak, *Total weight choosability of graphs*, Electronic J. Combinatorics 18 (2011), no. 1, Paper 112, 11 pp.

[14] B. Seamone, *Bounding the monomial index and (1,l)-weight choosability of a graph*, Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science, 16, No. 3 (2014), 173-188.

[15] G. Wang and G. Yan. *An Improved Upper Bound on Edge Weight Choosability of Graphs*, Graphs and Combinatorics, DOI:10.1007/s00373-014-1479-0, 2014.

[16] T. Wang and Q. L. Yu, *A note on vertex-coloring* 13*-edge-weighting*, Frontier Math. 4 in China, 3 (2008), 1-7.

[17] T. Wong, J. Wu, and X. Zhu, *Total weight choosability of Cartesian product of graphs*, European J. Combinatorics 33 (2012), 1725-1738.

[18] T. Wong, D. Yang and X. Zhu, *List total weighting of graphs*, Fete of combinatorics and computer science, 337-353, Bolyai Soc. Math. Stud., 20, Janos Bolyai Math. Soc., Budapest, 2010.

[19] T. Wong and X. Zhu, *Total weight choosability of graphs*, J. Graph Theory 66 (2011), 198-212.

[20] T. Wong and X. Zhu, *Permanent index of matrices associated with graphs*, manuscript.

[21] T. Wong and X. Zhu, *Every graph is* $(2,3)$*-choosable*, Combinatorica, to appear.